Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

138

(1)

09-249 AUG 26 2009

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
William K. Suter, Clerk

Case No:

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

ANTHONY MARTINI

Petitioner,

v.

AT&T Inc.; AT&T Corp., AT&T Mobility Corp., and AT&T Mobility LLC.

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
ROBERT M. STONE
555 West Fifth Street, Suite 4000, Los Angeles, CA, 90014-1010
Tel.: 213-896-6691

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
ERIC A. SHUMSKY
1501 K STREET, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel.: 202-736-8496

ANTHONY MARTINI
2549 Eastbluff Dr., Suite 274
Newport Beach, CA,92660-3500
Email: amartini@attorneysaccess.com
(619) 201-7390
Petitioner / Pro-Se

QUESTIONS

1.) Did the U.S. District Judge violate the Petitioner's Constitutional Rights for a fair Trial by terminating the Case far too early?

2.) Did the U.S. District Judge violate the Petitioner's Rights for a fair and speedy Trial by spending nearly a year concentrating only on the Defendants' Motion To Dismiss instead of the Petitioner's actual Complaint?

3.) Is a Motion To Dismiss a Legal Response to a Complaint?

4.) Does the U.S. District Court have Jurisdiction over AT&T Inc.?

5.) Does the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit or any Appellant Court in the United States have Jurisdiction to hear an Appeal

6.) from the U.S. District Court against the Defendant AT&T Inc.?

7.) Is the Defendant AT&T Inc. obstructing Justice by hiding behind it's Trademark which is AT&T?

8.) Can a Petitioner sue a Trademark like AT&T instead of the Corporation or a Limited Liability Company?

9.) Is the Defendant AT&T Inc. who uses their Trademark AT&T dominating the world with respect to Telecommunications?

10.) Is the Defendant AT&T Inc. guilty of conducting illegal wiretaps for their own personal and criminal gains and selling the information of all communications and whereabouts of the Petitioner to a foreign Country for over thirty years to have the Petitioner murdered?

11.) Did the Defendant AT&T Inc. violate International Laws and United Nations Laws and the United States Laws to personally persecute the Petitioner for over thirty years?

12.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. or any Telecommunications have the Legal Right to conduct Illegal Wiretaps on a Private Citizen for over thirty years and to terrorize the Petitioner and to make sure the Petitioner is finally murdered for their own personal and criminal gains by selling the Petitioner's telephone conversations and whereabouts to the highest bidder?

13.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. have the Legal Right to conduct illegal wiretaps on the Petitioner when he is with other Telecom Communication Companies like Verizon, Time Warner, Alltel?

14.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. have the Legal Right to send thousands and thousands of

viruses to the Petitioner's Computers, Servers and Emails on a daily basis to totally financially destroy the Petitioner?

15.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. have the Legal Right to use their Lines that the Petitioner is paying for to hack into the Petitioner's Computers and Servers and delete all data and programs?

16.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. have the Legal Right to bribe Politicians, Judges, Paralegals, Attorneys, Government Employees and the President of the United States of America for their own personal and criminal gains for World Domination of the Telecom Industry?

17.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. have the Legal Right to place over ninety percent of Law Firms in the United States on Contract Basis and use those Law Firms as Special Appearance Attorneys or Wholesale Attorneys so no one can

ever obtain an Attorney to file a Lawsuit or Complaint against AT&T Inc.?

18.) Does a Special Appearance or a Wholesale Attorney have the Legal Right to remain in Court for one year filing Motions and accepting a Trial Date?

19.) Does a U.S. District Court Judge have the Legal Right to allow Special Appearance Attorneys or Wholesale Attorneys to remain in Court and on the Complaint for one year even though the Petitioner objected numerous times that the Defendants did not properly Retain a General Attorney?

20.) Did the United States District Court Judge discriminate against the Petitioner who was a Pro-Se by holding the Petitioner above higher standards than an Attorney with respect to the Petitioner's Filings, Motions, Responses and Pleadings?

21.) Did the United States District Court Judge discriminate against the Petitioner when the Judge continued to allow the Defendants' Wholesale Attorneys to discriminate against the Petitioner, conduct character assassination against the Petitioner and name calling of the Petitioner in his Court?

22.) Did the U.S. District Judge infringe on the Petitioner's Rights by allowing the Defendants Wholesale Attorneys or Special Appearance Attorneys to insert the Petitioner's Immigration Files as well as the Petitioner's wife's Immigration Files as a Response to the Petitioner's Complaint?

23.) Did the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit violate the Petitioner's Rights for a fair Appeal by allowing Paralegals to hear an Appeal instead of a Panel of Three Judges?

24.) Did the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit violate all Laws of the United States by allowing Paralegals to fraudulently

issue Unsigned Orders and inserting a Panel of Three Judges names that have never, ever seen or heard an Appeal from the Petitioner?

25.) Did the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit commit Legal Theft by accepting the Petitioners monies and not giving service which is denying the Petitioner the right for his Appeal to be heard by a Panel of Three Judges?

26.) Is the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit's Paralegals permitted to be extremely hostile, rude and arrogant to the Petitioner when the Petitioner is only asking for the Status of the Case?

27.) Did the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit discriminate against the Petitioner by merging the Petitioner's Immigration Appeal with the Petitioner's Appeal against the Defendants AT&T Inc. et al?

28.) Did the U.S. District Judge violate the Petitioner's Legal Rights by not hearing a Motion to have the Defendants Wholesale Attorneys or Special Appearance Attorneys removed from the File and Complaint?

29.) Does the U.S. District Judge have the Legal Right to issue Tentative Orders before the next Court Hearing of which the Tentative Order is usually drafted by the Judge's Assistant?

30.) Does the U.S. District Judge have the Legal Right to entertain a Motion To Dismiss from a Wholesale Attorney or Special Appearance Attorney?

31.) Does the U.S. District Judge have the Legal Right to accept a Complaint as is from a Pro-Se even if the Pro-Se Complaint is not one million percent perfect?

32.) Does the Petitioner as a Pro-Se have the Legal Right to proceed to Trial against the Defendants AT&T Inc. et all?

33.) Did the United States District Judge violate the Petitioner's Legal Rights by not entering a Default Judgment on the Defendants when the Defendants did not respond to the Petitioner's Complaint or Amended Complaint?

34.) Did the U.S. District Court Judge violate the Petitioner's Legal Rights by not placing an Injunction on the Defendants when the Petitioner filed a Motion for an Injunction against the Defendants to stop the Defendants from attacking the Petitioner's websites, Domain Names, hacking into the Petitioner's Servers and destroying the Petitioner's data?

35.) Did the U.S. District Judge victimize and punish the victim which is the Petitioner by entering a Judgment against the Petitioner for filing a Complaint against the Defendants AT&T

et al when the Petitioner was trying to obtain Justice?

36.) Did the U.S. District Judge go above and beyond the scope of the Law by entering a blank check which is a blank Judgment with no amount stated against the Petitioner?

37.) Does the U.S. District Judge have the Legal Right to discriminate against the Petitioner because the Petitioner is a Legal and Lawful Political Refugee when the Presiding Judge had full information that the Petitioner is a Political Refugee in the United States?

38.) Does the U.S. District Court have the Legal Right to ignore International Laws and United Nations Laws and not hear any Complaint from a Petitioner who is a Legal Political Refugee and who was politically persecuted worldwide because of the Defendant AT&T Inc.?

39.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. have the Legal Right to defraud the States and the United States of Taxes that they avoid paying by filtering and laundering money from one dummy Corporation to another dummy Corporation?

40.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. have the Legal Right to wiretap all American Citizens Phone Lines and sell that information to any American Government Agencies?

41.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. have the Legal Authority to allow Private Contractors and Subcontractors to conduct illegal wiretaps on the Petitioner's Phone Lines?

42.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. have the Legal Right to conduct illegal wiretaps against Judges when the Courts are hearing a Complaint against AT&T Inc.?

43.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. have the Legal Right to conduct illegal wiretaps on the White House and the President of the United

States and sell the conversations to other Countries and enemies of the United States?

44.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. who hides behind their Trademark AT&T have the Legal Right to conduct illegal wiretaps of the U.S. Department of Justice and sell the conversations to foreign Countries and to the enemies of the United States?

45.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. have the Legal Right to use Fiber Optic Wires to have Live Videos of the White House at all times and sell the Live Videos to Britain, Canada, India, Pakistan and enemies of the United States?

46.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. known as AT&T the Trademark have the Legal Right to conduct illegal wiretaps of all U.S. Embassies, U.S. Consulates and Ambassadors with Live Videos and sell that information to foreign Countries?

47.) Does the Defendant AT&T Inc. have the Legal Right to place a Contract on the lives of the Whistle Blowers when the Defendant AT&T Inc. naughty secrets and criminal activities are exposed by current employees?

48.) Does a foreign Country have the Legal Right to own AT&T Inc. and conduct illegal wiretaps on everybody's phone lines and sell that information to the highest bidders worldwide?

49.) Should the Defendant AT&T Inc. that hides behind their Trademark AT&T be charged and fined by the U.S. Department of Justice for monopolizing the Telecom Industry in the United States and monopolizing the Telecom Industry world wide by hiding under thousands and thousands of their sister companies?

50.) Should the Defendant AT&T Inc. be forced to stop using their Trademark of AT&T and hiding behind their Trademark of AT&T instead of using AT&T Inc.?

51.) Is the Defendant AT&T Inc. committing fraud with the Securities and Exchange by pretending that the Defendant AT&T Inc. is only a Holding Company and does not do Business but collects money from Customers and offers products and services of which the Defendant AT&T Inc. does not declare to the Investors and Securities and Exchange?

52.) Is the Defendant AT&T Inc. guilty of not paying its taxes to the States or to the IRS by indicating that AT&T Inc. is only a Holding Company and does not do any Business in any way, shape or form?

53.) Does the Petitioner who is a father and had his second daughter murdered at seventeen months old because of the Defendant AT&T Inc. illegal actions have the Legal Right to file a Lawsuit or Complaint against the Defendant AT&T Inc. and to obtain Justice for his murdered daughter?

54.) Does the U.S. District Judge have the Legal Right to enter a Judgment against the Petitioner when the U.S. District Judge said he had no jurisdiction over the Defendant AT&T Inc.?

55.) Does the U.S. District Judge have the Legal Right to totally ignore all of the Petitioner's Case Notes and Statues pertaining to the Petitioner's Motions and the Petitioner's Complaint?

56.) Should the Defendant AT&T Inc. be banned from Filing any Complaints in all U.S. District Courts since the U.S. District Court continues to indicate that they do not have Jurisdiction over AT&T Inc.?

57.) Is the U.S. District Court violating the Petitioner's Rights by indicating that the U.S. District Court does not have Jurisdiction over AT&T Inc. in any State in the United States but accepts Complaints from AT&T Inc. in any U.S. District Court?

58.) Does the Defendants have the Legal Right to send the same fraudulent Bill to six different Collection Agencies to numerous different States to destroy the Petitioner's excellent name and excellent credit even though the Petitioner does not owe the Defendants any money?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS ..... I - XVI

TABLE OF CONTENTS XVII

INDEX OF APPENDICES..... XVIII

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... XIX-XXII

OPINIONS BELOW XXIII

JURISDICTION XXIII

STATEMENT OF CASE ..... XXIV-XXXV

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION...
.....XXXV-XXXVI

HISTORY 1-36

RELIEF 37-38

CONCLUSION 38-43

APPENDIX "A" 1a-3a

APPENDIX "B" 4a-6a

APPENDIX "C" 7a-8a

APPENDIX "D" 9a-16a

INDEX OF APPENDICES

Appendix A - Per Order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Filed Jul 01 2009 ..... 1a-3a

Appendix B - Per Order (Denying Re-Open)of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Filed May 15, 2009 ..... 4a-6a

Appendix C - Per Order (Judgment) of the United States District Court Central District of California - Filed March 04, 2009 ..... 7a-8a

Appendix D - Per Order of the United States District Court Central District of California - Filed - Feb 23, 2009 ..... 9a-18a

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

28 USC 1331 - Sec. 1331 XXVII

"Cyber Promotions, Inc. v. America Online, Inc., 948 F.Supp. 456 (E.D. Pa. 1996) " XXVII

"Compuserve Incorporated v. Cyber Promotions, Inc., 962 F.Supp. 1015 (S.D. Ohio 1997)" .. XXVIII

"International Shoe Co.v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310 (1945)" XXVIII

Minnesota v. Granite Gate Resorts, Inc., 568 N.W.2d 715 (Minn. 1997) " XXVIII

"California Software, Inc. v. Reliability Research, Inc., 631 F.Supp. 1356 (C.D. Cal. 1986)" ... XXVIII

"Compuserve, Inc. v. Patterson, 89 F.3d 1257 (6th Cir. 1996)" XXVIII

Jurisdiction in Cyberspace XXVIII

"Bensusan Restaurant Corp. v. King, 937 F. Supp. 295 (S.D.N.Y. 1996), aff'd, 126 F.3d 25 (2d Cir. 1997)" XXVIII

"Cody v. Ward, 954 F. Supp. 43 (D. Conn. 1997)" XXVIII

"Inset Systems, Inc. v. Instruction Set, Inc., 937 F.Supp. 161 (D. Conn. 1996)" XXVIII

"Cybersell, Inc. v. Cybersell, Inc., 130 F.3d 414 (9th Cir. 1997)" XXIX

"State v. Lebron, 97 Ohio App.3d 155 (Ohio Ct. App. 1994)" XXIX

"U.S. v. Riggs, 739 F.Supp. 414 (N.D. Ill. 1990)" XXIX

"U.S. v. Sablan, 92 F.3d 865 (9th Cir. 1995)" XXII

"Inset Systems, Inc. v. Instructions Set, Inc. , 937 F. Supp. 161 (D. Conn. 1996), ... XXIX-XXX

"CompuServe, Inc. v. Patterson , 89 F.3d 1257 (6th Cir. 1996) XXX

"Zippo Manufacturing Co. v. Zippo Dot Com, Inc. , 952 F. Supp. 1119 (W.D. Pa. 1997) XXX

"Minnesota v. Granite Gate Resorts, Inc. , 568 N.W.2d. 715 (Ct. App. MN, 1997) ..... XXX-XXXI

Fredric Goldman and Kimberly Goldman v. Orenthal James Simpson- Superior Court of The State of California For The County Of Los Angeles Case No SC 036340 – Complaint For Damages For Wrongful Death..... XXXI

OPINION BELOW

The Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has not been published in this case.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was **JULY 1, 2009.**

[X] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: **MAY 15, 2009,** AND A COPY OF THE ORDER DENYING REHEARING APPEARS AT Appendix "B" .

The Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Petitioner filed a Complaint in the U.S. District Court in Santa Ana, California against the Defendants AT&T Inc., AT&T Corp., AT&T Mobility Corp., and AT&T Mobility LLC. For Fifty-Seven Billion Dollars Plus Punitive Damages on Monday, March 17, 2008 Case No. SACV08-00294 AG (RNBx).

The Petitioner accuses the Defendant AT&T Inc. of conducting Illegal Wire Taps and selling the Petitioners Information and Whereabouts to a Foreign Country for over 30 Years.

The Petitioner accuses the Defendant AT&T Inc. known as AT&T of Conspiracy to Commit Murder and being accomplices to murder and attempted murder.

The Petitioner accuses the Defendant AT&T Inc. of being accomplices to the kidnapping

of his two daughters and the Murder of his Second Daughter.

The Petitioner accuses the Defendant AT&T Inc. of Illegal Web Tapping, Cyber Terrorism, sending the Petitioner massive Spam emails and stopping the Petitioner Traffic to all of his websites that prevents the Petitioner from making any money on the Internet.

The Petitioner accuses the Defendant AT&T Inc. of committing a Terrorist Act against the Petitioner for over thirty years.

The Petitioner accuses the Defendant AT&T Mobility Corp., and AT&T Mobility LLC. Of conducting Illegal Wire Taps on the Petitioner Cell Phone and sending the same Fraudulent Bill to six Different Collection Agencies in numerous Different States to destroy the Petitioner Excellent Name and Excellent Credit.

The Petitioner accuses the Defendant AT&T Corp. of conducting Illegal Wiretaps on the Plaintiff land lines, cell phones, fax and that the

Defendant AT&T Corp has initiated web tapping on the Plaintiff 300 plus Internet Domain Names.

The Petitioner was a subscriber to Land Lines, Fax Lines from the Defendant AT&T for over thirty Years.

The Petitioner was a subscriber to Internet Services from the Defendant AT&T Inc. from 1995-2001 in Canada.

The Petitioner was a subscriber to Business Land Lines, Business Fax Lines, Business Internet Services from AT&T Inc. and AT&T Corp from October 2006 to approximately March 2008 in the State of California.

The Petitioner paid his bills online to AT&T Inc. from 2006 to 2008.

The Defendants have used a Special Appearance Attorney or a Special Appearance Attorney known as "Wholesale Attorneys" from the Law Firm of Sidley Austin LLP from March 2008 to the current date.

The Defendants did not have a General Counsel or an Attorney on Record at all times during the proceedings of this Complaint and during any Court Appearance.

The Defendants through their "Wholesale Attorneys have repeatedly filed Motions to Dismiss Petitioner Complaint due to lack of jurisdiction.

The Petitioner have repeatedly argued that the U.S. District Court has personal Jurisdiction over the Defendants *See 28 USC 1331 - Sec. 1331* that reads as follows: *"The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States."*

The Petitioner has also argued before the U.S. District Court and also before the United States Court of Appeals that the U.S. District Court does have Jurisdiction over the Defendants

See *"Cyber Promotions, Inc. v. America Online, Inc., 948 F.Supp. 456 (E.D. Pa. 1996)"*

See *"Compuserve Incorporated v. Cyber Promotions, Inc., 962 F.Supp. 1015 (S.D. Ohio 1997)"*

See *"International Shoe Co.v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310 (1945)"*

See "Minnesota v. Granite Gate Resorts, Inc., 568 N.W.2d 715 (Minn. 1997) "

See *"California Software, Inc. v. Reliability Research, Inc., 631 F.Supp. 1356 (C.D. Cal. 1986)"*

See "Compuserve, Inc. v. Patterson, 89 F.3d 1257 (6th Cir. 1996)"

Jurisdiction in Cyberspace

See "Bensusan Restaurant Corp. v. King, 937 F. Supp. 295 (S.D.N.Y. 1996), aff'd, 126 F.3d 25 (2d Cir. 1997)"

See "Cody v. Ward, 954 F. Supp. 43 (D. Conn. 1997)"

See *"Inset Systems, Inc. v. Instruction Set, Inc., 937 F.Supp. 161 (D. Conn. 1996)"*

See *"Cybersell, Inc. v. Cybersell, Inc., 130 F.3d 414 (9th Cir. 1997)"*

See *"State v. Lebron, 97 Ohio App.3d 155 (Ohio Ct. App. 1994)"*

See "U.S. v. Riggs, 739 F.Supp. 414 (N.D. Ill. 1990)"

See "U.S. v. Sablan, 92 F.3d 865 (9th Cir. 1995)"

"In the case of - Inset Systems, Inc. v. Instructions Set, Inc. , 937 F. Supp. 161 (D. Conn. 1996), the only activity that the Web Site operator engaged in besides maintaining its Internet Site was providing a toll-free number on the Site. Although seemingly innocuous, the court perceived the toll-free number as an attempt to solicit business in the forum state and extended personal jurisdiction over the defendant. Similarly, in *Heroes, Inc. v. Heros Foundation* , the district court found that a charity organization purposefully availed itself of the privilege of doing business in the forum state by

expressly soliciting donations and providing a toll-free number on its Internet Web Site. [5] And, in Minnesota v. Granite Gate Resorts , a criminal case, the court conferred jurisdiction based on the number of "hits" that a Web Site received, the number of different locations within the forum states that accessed the Web Site, and the fact that the Web Site's mailing list included residents of the forum state."

See "CompuServe, Inc. v. Patterson , 89 F.3d 1257 (6th Cir. 1996) (asserting personal jurisdiction where the defendant sold software over the Internet to twelve people in the forum state)"

See "Zippo Manufacturing Co. v. Zippo Dot Com, Inc. , 952 F. Supp. 1119 (W.D. Pa. 1997) (noting that in addition to operating a web-site, the operator's conduct in charging a fee to enter its web-site amounted to electronic commerce with the forum state's residents)."

See "Minnesota v. Granite Gate Resorts, Inc. , 568 N.W.2d. 715 (Ct. App. MN, 1997)

(finding that the forum state's residents were regular visitors to the web-site, as there were over 248 different locations in the forum state that accessed the defendant's web-site)."

See also the case of

"Fredric Goldman and Kimberly Goldman v. Orenthal James Simpson"- Superior Court of The State of California For The County Of Los Angeles Case No SC 036340 – Complaint For Damages For Wrongful Death.

While the Presiding Judge, Judge Andrew J. Guilford ignored the Petitioner Complaint, Case Notes and Statues the Presiding Judge also had full knowledge at all times that the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was going to pass all Pro-Se's Appeals to Paralegals in the Appeal Court and not allow a Panel of Three Judges to handle the Petitioner Appeal because the Petitioner is Pro-Se.

The Petitioner immediately filed an Appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit hoping that his Appeal was going to be handled by a Panel of three Judges and allow the Petitioner time to file his Brief.

However the Paralegals issued an Order unsigned pretending that a Panel of three Judges heard the Petitioner's Appeal and immediately denied the Petitioner's Appeal. The Petitioner was given dates for his Brief and the Appeal was stopped by Paralegals who perhaps received a kick back from AT&T. stopping the Petitioner from sending his Brief.

It is a normal Practice with AT&T to Bribe Judges, Paralegals to Dismiss any Complaint or any Appeal.

The Petitioner had over Twenty-Seven Major Corporations destroyed, two daughters kidnapped, one daughter murdered and was subject to numerous Murder Attempts that was caused by the Defendant AT&T.

XXXIII

The Petitioner was made permanently disabled for the rest of his life and received a slow execution that was caused by the Defendant AT&T Inc. Illegal Actions being accomplices to attempted murder.

AT&T is the world's largest Terrorist Organization.

The Petitioner had a Legal Right to go to Trial to show over Ten Thousands Pages of Evidence, Video and Audio tapes before a Jury and the Presiding Judge, Judge Andrew J. Guilford violated the Petitioner Rights to go to Trial and have his case heard by a Jury.

The Presiding Judge Violated the Petitioner's Rights for a Fair and Speedy Trial and also committed the worse Sin by allowing Murders to walk free and denying a Father to seek Justice against the Defendants who he held Responsible for his Second Daughter's Murder and the Murder of his Adopted Mother that was caused by the Defendant Illegal Actions.

XXXIV

The Presiding Judge, Judge, Andrew J. Guildford violated International Laws and United Nations Laws that allow a Political Refugee the legal right to file their Complaint in a Federal Court and to hear a Complaint from a Political Refugee.

The Petitioner has been trying to seek Justice for Thirty Years of his life of which Justice was always denied by Judges being paid off by AT&T Inc. and the Defendants will never stop the Persecution against the Petitioner.

The Petitioner paid Attorneys over Ten Million Dollars in Legal Expenses to bring the Defendant AT&T Inc. to Trial. However the Defendant, AT&T Inc. has bought Judges, Paralegals, Court Administrators, Politicians and the Petitioner perhaps will also not get Justice at the United States Supreme Court.

However, the Petitioner is not finished with his Complaint and will proceed forward with all of

the Defendants to the International Courts and the World Criminal Courts and will bring all CEO, Presidents for the past thirty years to the International Courts, the International Criminal Courts and the World Courts to finally get Justice against the Defendants and their employees.

The Petitioner has lost all hope with the United States Legal System and the United States Courts and the Petitioner will continue the Legal War outside of the United States until the Defendants are all brought to Trial.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The Petitioner has totally exhausted all Legal Procedures in Canada and in the United States against the Defendants including an Appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit that was only heard by Paralegals and not a Panel of Three Judges.

XXXVI

The Defendants have in the Past paid Off and Bribed, Judges, Paralegals and Politicians to stop the Petitioner from going to Trial.

The Petitioner has the Legal Right to go forward to Trial. However, the Defendants continue to this day and thirty years later buying Judges and Government Employees.

The Petitioner has a Legal Right to Proceed with Legal Actions against the Defendants who are Murderers, a Terrorist Organization and the Petitioner has a Constitutional Right to be heard before a Jury to have his Case proceed forward.

If the United States Supreme Court does not allow the Petitioner to proceed forward then the Defendants will make sure that the Petitioner is finally Murdered and the United States Supreme Court will have the blood of the Petitioner on their hands.

HISTORY

The Petitioner Anthony Martini was a Freelance Reporter, a Former Private Investigator and an Entrepreneur who owned over twenty-seven major corporations.

The Petitioner investigated stories and followed up on leads and wrote articles exposing corruption among Politicians, Police Officers, Judges and Government Employees.

The Petitioner wrote numerous Articles that were published in Canadian Newspapers that exposed Corruption at the highest levels of Governments.

The Petitioner was unaware that when he was writing his stories and exposing the Truth that he was dealing with an Elite Society that are a Terrorist Organization. Nor did the Plaintiff realize that the Government Employees, Politicians, Police Officers were members of a

Domestic and International Terrorist Organization.

The Petitioner had all of his land lines, cell phones illegally wire tapped by AT&T Inc. known as "AT&T" for over 30 years no matter where the Petitioner was living or travelling.

The Petitioner was investigating Government Employees, Politicians, Police Officers, Judges and Attorneys that were all members of the Bilderberg, Freemasons, and the Good Ole Boys Network which are all Domestic and International Terrorist Organizations without realizing that his Articles were going to be a subject of Political Persecution and Political Torture and numerous attempted murders, murders and kidnapping.

The Corrupt Canadian Government Employees used the Defendants AT&T to illegally wire tap the Petitioner's Phone lines and cell phones from the late 1970's to 2001 without any Court Order issued in Canada or the United States.

The Petitioner had all of his 27 major Corporations destroyed by the Canadian Government because of the Defendant AT&T Inc.

The Petitioner travelled as a Freelance Reporter to Venezuela in the 1980's and where ever the Petitioner traveled to or resided the Petitioner had his Phone Lines and all communications Illegally Wire Taped.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. sold the information of the Petitioner at all times to a Foreign Government which was Canada.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. willfully knew that their Illegal Actions would result in the Petitioner being Politically Persecuted and Tortured and the Defendant AT&T Inc. escalated their Illegal Wire Taps and sold the Petitioner whereabouts at all times to a Group of Terrorist members.

The Petitioner was in Venezuela at the wrong place and wrong time taking pictures in a Mountain where the Petitioner witnessed a cold

blooded execution by three Members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police ("R.C.M.P.") executing an innocent person in cold blood and murdering an innocent person. The Petitioner took photos of the execution and was being shot at by the three Canadian Police Officers.

The Petitioner made calls using AT&T lines to his friends and gave his friends negatives of the murder. A few weeks later three of the Petitioner's friends were murdered.

The Petitioner had to flee for his life from Venezuela and had assistance from the United States Embassy.

The Petitioner arrived in Miami Florida Airport from Venezuela and was attacked in a public washroom by one of the three members of the R.C.M.P. that executed an innocent person in Venezuela.

The Petitioner was left with a severe head concussion from the Attempted Murder and a cracked scull.

The Petitioner returned back to Canada and received a phone call within 24 hours to go to the RCMP Headquarters.

The Petitioner went to the R.C.M.P. Headquarters where the Petitioner was questioned on what he had seen in Venezuela.

The petitioner did not tell anyone and only spoke on the Telephone to his friends.

The Petitioner was badly beaten at the R.C.M.P. Headquarters and the Petitioner's head was smashed into a concrete wall that resulted in severe head injury and the Petitioner's Passport was stolen by the R.C.M.P.

The Petitioner was threatened by an R.C.M.P. Officer that if the Petitioner ever exposed what happened in Venezuela then the R.C.M.P. would murder the Petitioner adoptive father and his adoptive mother.

The Petitioner continued writing articles and exposing corruption and spoke to witnesses by phone.

The Petitioner was unaware that his telephones and cell phones were illegally wiretapped by the Defendant AT&T Inc. and his information was being sold by AT&T.

The Petitioner received numerous beatings by the Canadian Police Agencies and the R.C.M.P. almost on a weekly basis.

The Petitioner ran an Organization that looked and retrieved Missing and Abducted Children and that Organization was destroyed by the Defendant AT&T Inc. which endangered Children's Lives because the Defendant AT&T Inc. sold the Petitioner's investigation information to the abductor.

The Petitioner had his Organization destroyed because of the Defendant AT&T Inc. Illegal Actions.

The Petitioner was a Real Estate Developer and Builder and built thousands of homes and the Petitioner had his Business destroyed because the Defendant AT&T Inc. sold telephone information

to a Foreign Country which was Canada for their own Personal and Criminal Gains.

The Petitioner's Conversations that he had on the Phone with his Customers were sold by the Defendant AT&T Inc. to the Competition and also to the Canadian Government.

The Petitioner had his Real Estate Business totally destroyed because of the Defendant AT&T Inc. Illegal Actions.

The Petitioner owned a lucrative Computer Store and within less then one year the Petitioner's Computer Store was destroyed because the Defendant AT&T Inc. sold the Petitioner's Business Accounts to the highest bidder and destroyed the Petitioner's Computer Store.

The Petitioner was investigating a story that the R.C.M.P. was shipping tons and tons of Cocaine and other street drugs to the United States.

The Petitioner was making calls investigating the story.

In 1992 the Petitioner wrote a story exposing the R.C.M.P. and the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P. who had illegal ties to the Columbian Cartel, the Mexican Cartel and also with the Hong Kong Cartel.

The Petitioner who was also a Computer Expert was asked by an acquaintance of his that was an R.C.M.P. officer to repair the Main Frame at the R.C.M.P. Head Office.

The Petitioner found files on the R.C.M.P. Computers with dates, times and locations of the R.C.M.P. Smuggling Cocaine into the United States.

The Petitioner also discovered that the R.C.M.P. also had Bank Accounts in the United States and in Europe where the R.C.M.P. were hiding trillions of dollars that was received through Major Illegal Drugs in the United States.

The Petitioner passed all the information over to the F.B.I.

The Petitioner wrote the article but that Article was never published but instead it was given to the R.C.M.P. who decided to Persecute the Petitioner.

The Petitioner also saw in the R.C.M.P. Main Frame, Contracts placed on his life by the former Prime Minister of Canada that read as follows: "*Martini has brought grave harm to the Politicians in Canada and to the Political Arena. Terminate Martini life and make it look like an accident.*"

The Petitioner also worked on a Canadian Police Agency Main Frame and also saw a Contract placed on his life from the Mayor in a Canadian City that said as follows: "*Kill Martini and make it look like an accident.*"

The Petitioner had numerous murder attempts on his life and no matter if the Petitioner went to pick up groceries or shopping or

going out for dinner the R.C.M.P. always knew where the Petitioner was at all times because of the Defendant AT&T Inc. Illegal actions conducting Illegal wire taps on the Petitioner Phones and giving every step of the Petitioner to a foreign Government which is Canada.

When the F.B.I. went to Canada to question the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P. because of the Petitioner investigation then the Commissioner put a bullet through his head and blew his brains out and died in 1993.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. that was conducting Illegal Wire Taps on the Petitioner again sold the conversation to the R.C.M.P. which resulted in numerous Murder Attempts on the Petitioner life.

The Petitioner's first daughter was kidnapped in 1991 because of the Defendant AT&T Inc. selling the Petitioner's Secure Address.

The Petitioner in 1995 made reservations for dinner at a Restaurant over the Phone.

The Petitioner did not tell anyone that he was going out for dinner and the Petitioner was attacked by four guys the size of football players that were over 6'4" and weighed over 250 lbs.

The Petitioner was left unconscious and received numerous broken bones, back injury and severe head injury. If it was not for two Samaritans that came to the Petitioner rescue the Petitioner would not be alive today.

The Petitioner was rushed to the hospital and was in a coma for three weeks. When the Petitioner came to he could not talk and could not walk.

The Petitioner who used to speak five languages had to learn how to speak English again and had to learn how to walk again.

If the Defendant AT&T Inc. had not conducted illegal wiretaps on the Petitioner phone lines and sold the information of the Petitioner to

a Foreign Country which was Canada then the Petitioner would have not received an attempted murder on his life.

The Petitioner suffered severe long term and short term memory loss because of the Defendant AT&T Inc.

The Petitioner's Adopted Mother was murdered in 1995 because of the Defendant AT&T Inc. Illegal Actions selling information to a Foreign Country being accomplices and accessory to murder.

In 1996 the Petitioner had a Second Daughter and when the Petitioner Second Daughter was thirteen Months Old the Petitioner had sole custody of his daughter.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. sold the secure address of the Petitioner to the Canadian Government and also to the R.C.M.P. that had the Petitioner attacked in the middle of the night and the Petitioner was left unconscious to die.

When the Petitioner woke up three days later he was full of blood and his second daughter was missing.

The Petitioner's Second Daughter was murdered at seventeen months old because the Defendant AT&T Inc. sold the Petitioner's Secure Address to the Petitioner's Enemies which was the Canadian Government and also to the R.C.M.P.

In 1998 the Petitioner's best friend who was head of Security at AT&T in Canada contacted the Petitioner for a meeting at the AT&T Secure Room.

The Secure Room at AT&T was an entire hidden floor with no access to the Public.

The Petitioner was shown an entire wall of all the Illegal Wire Tapping on the Petitioner Phone Lines which spanned over 25 years.

The Petitioner's best friend who was head of security also showed the Petitioner a Video and Audio Surveillance that the Defendant AT&T Inc.

was doing on all U.S. Embassies World Wide and the Defendant AT&T Inc. was selling that Information to Canada, Britain and any other Country World Wide.

The Petitioner's best friend that was head of Security of AT&T also showed the Petitioner Illegal Wire Taps both Audio and Video at The White House.

The Defendants AT&T Inc. was selling all classified information of the United States to enemies of the United States to have Telecommunication Control World Wide and World Domination.

The Petitioner was given several big brown envelopes that was marked classified from his friend who was head of Security at AT&T that exposed AT&T selling information about the United States to enemies of the United States and Classified information about AT&T being World Domination for the Telecom Industry and also classified information of the Petitioner's conversation records and to prove that AT&T was

conducting Illegal Wiretaps against the Petitioner for over twenty-five years.

When the Petitioner filed the largest Lawsuit in Canada against AT&T and the Canadian Government that Lawsuit was quickly dismissed, faster than it was filed.

The Petitioner was given a Cassette of a conversation that was held behind closed doors between the Presiding Judge and the Attorneys for AT&T who said, "If you throw out Martini case you will be well rewarded." The presiding Judge was given a big brown envelope with Fifty Thousand Dollars in Cash and received a Mink Coat, Diamond Bracelet, Diamond Necklace, a new luxury Jaguar, and the Judge's Husband received a New Mercedes Benz and the presiding Judge also had the balance of her Mortgage for her Mansion paid off which was $600,000.00 .

The Petitioner received the recorded meeting on a Cassette from the Judge's Secretary and the Petitioner still has this tape.

The Case against AT&T was quickly dismissed by the Corrupt Judge who accepted the Bribe Money from AT&T Attorneys.

The Presiding Judge in Canada who accepted the Bribe Money from AT&T Attorneys was rewarded with a position as a Justice at the Supreme Court of Canada.

The Petitioner moved to many Provinces in Canada to avoid Political Persecution and Political Torture and no matter where the Petitioner moved the Petitioner was Politically Persecuted and the Police Beatings and the Attempted Murder Continued.

In April 2001 the Petitioner had 3,927 Internet Domain Names Stolen because of the Defendant AT&T Inc. who gave all the Petitioner's Domain Names to the Canadian Government who used an American Company of VeriSign and Network Solutions to Steal the Petitioner's 3,927 Internet Domain Names.

The Petitioner had a friend who was an Attorney General in Canada and because the Attorney General was assisting the Petitioner with Legal Issues the Attorney General lost his position.

The Petitioner also had a friend that was the Minister of Justice and because the Petitioner was communicating with his friend with respect to the Defendant AT&T Inc. the Minister of Justice had a mysterious Car Accident. However, the Petitioner suspected that his friend was murdered because of the Defendant AT&T Inc.

The Petitioner also made Home Made Fudge and sold his Home Made Fudge in Retail Stores and the Petitioner was making over $5,000.00 per Month but since the Petitioner was communicating with his Clients over the Phone the Defendant AT&T Inc. sold the Petitioner's Clients and Conversations to the Corrupt Canadian Politicians who gave that information they illegally obtained to the Corrupt Police Agencies who went from Store to Store

threatening the Petitioner's Clients not to buy from the Petitioner or they would shut down their Stores.

The Petitioner was also a Publisher in Canada and started the first Canadian Computer Magazine and the Defendant AT&T Inc. recorded every single conversation and gave all the Petitioner's Clients to the Corrupt Canadian Politicians who again gave the Petitioner's Client List to the Canadian Police Agency who again threatened all the Petitioner's Customers that they would Shut them down if they did not immediately stop advertising with the Petitioner.

The Petitioner even lost jobs like digging ditches because the Defendant AT&T Inc. was conducting Illegal Wiretaps on the Petitioner's lines and selling information about the Petitioner's Daily Activities to the Corrupt Canadian Politicians who were members of a Domestic and International Terrorist Organization and giving that information to the

Canadian Police Agencies to intimidate or harass the Petitioner's Employers.

The Petitioner called his Doctor's Office numerous times on the phone before the Petitioner discovered that his lines were Illegally Wiretapped to schedule appointments because the Petitioner was having numerous major seizures and the Petitioner's Doctors were threatened by Police Officers not to treat the Petitioner anymore or their License would be cancelled and they would never be allowed to practice Medicine anywhere in Canada for the rest of their lives.

The Petitioner needed seizure medication for his severe seizures that was caused by the Murder Attempt on his life and the Petitioner was denied access to his Doctors because the Defendant AT&T Inc. was selling the Petitioner's Doctors Names and contact information and the Petitioner's Appointments to the Corrupt Canadian Government who were using the Canadian Police Agencies to intimidate the Petitioner's Doctors.

The Petitioner also needed Heart Medications and again the Petitioner was told by his doctors that they cannot see him anymore because they were threatened by the Police to stop treating the Petitioner as a patient or they will lose their Medical License.

The Petitioner's Attorneys kept on taking the Petitioner's money for Legal Actions but the Petitioner's Attorneys were threatened by the Canadian Police Agencies to not proceed with Legal Actions against AT&T Inc. or they would have their Bar License revoked.

The Petitioner's Wife Annette Martini owned two Construction Companies in her name and the Defendant AT&T Inc. gave the Canadian Government all illegal wiretaps of the Petitioner's Conversation and Customers and the Canadian Police Agencies destroyed the Petitioner's Wife's two Construction Companies.

The Canadian Government stole and seized the Petitioner's wife's numerous properties, homes, bank accounts without ever going to Court

and stole the Petitioner's Wife's homes that were under Construction without any Court Orders or any reasons given although the Petitioner and his wife Annette Martini paid their taxes each year and owed nothing to the Government.

The Canadian Government owes the Petitioner over Twenty-Five Million Dollars in taxes and the Canadian Government owes the Petitioner's Wife Annette Martini hundreds of thousands of Dollars in Taxes.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. even sold the Petitioner's wife's students to the Canadian Government where the Petitioner's wife was a Piano Teacher teaching her students Classical Music on Piano.

The Canadian Government took the Illegal Wire Taps of the Petitioner's wife talking to her students and sent the Canadian Police Agency to harass, intimidate and threaten the Petitioner's Wife's Parents of the Students to stop using the Petitioner's Wife as a Piano Teacher.

The Petitioner's wife Annette Martini was stalked by a Canadian Government Employee for over one and half years and the Stalker wanted to murder the Petitioner's wife. The Canadian Police Agencies refused to Arrest the Stalker even though the Stalker was under the Petitioner's window sitting in his car making threatening calls to the Petitioner's wife on his cell phone.

The Petitioner and his wife were legally married and the Petitioner invited over 200 of their friends to their wedding. The Defendant AT&T Inc. gave the conversations and names, addresses and phone numbers of the Petitioner and his wife's Guests to attend the Petitioner and his wife wedding.

The Canadian Government gave the Illegal Wiretaps and names, addresses and phone numbers of the Petitioner's Guests the Petitioner and his wife's wedding to the R.C.M.P. and other Police Agencies and the Police Agencies threatened the Petitioner's Guests not to show up at the Petitioner's wedding or else.

The Petitioner and his wife Annette Martini were expecting over 200 of their friends to show up for their Wedding and only less than 20 Guests showed up for their Wedding.

The Petitioner and his wife Annette Martini were finally forced to move from one Province in Canada and decided to live underground to escape Personal Persecution, Torture, and Numerous Murder Attempts.

On the day of the move the Petitioner had a Moving Company picking up all of their possessions and the R.C.M.P. blocked the Moving Truck and then followed the Moving Truck to the Moving Truck Warehouse.

The R.C.M.P. went to the Moving Storage Warehouse and went through every single box without any court order and stole the Petitioner's Evidence that the R.C.M.P. was shipping massive Cocaine to the United States and also evidence to prove that AT&T was conducting Illegal Wiretaps on the Petitioner's Phone Lines, Internet, Email Accounts etc.

The Petitioner moved to another province in Canada about 3,000 miles away and lived underground for 2 years.

The Petitioner had all of their Furniture, clothes, prize winning photos, family photos, tapes, videos of their children and everything that was owned by the Petitioner and his wife all stolen by the Canadian Government.

The Petitioner Anthony Martini and his wife Annette Martini lived underground in Canada for 2 years sleeping on a cold floor with no furniture and no clothes eating bread and water with just the clothes on their backs.

The Petitioner had a bad tooth that needed the care of a Dentist and the R.C.M.P. suspected that the Petitioner was in that neighborhood but did not have an exact location of the Petitioner so the R.C.M.P. contacted every Doctor within 20 square miles and threatened the Doctors, Dentist and Neurologists not to treat the Petitioner.

The Petitioner was in severe pain because of a bad tooth for over two months and no matter what Dentist the Petitioner contacted as soon as the Petitioner mentioned his name the Petitioner was Denied Medical Attention even though the Petitioner was going to pay for the Medical Treatment in Cash.

The Petitioner had to travel over 300 miles to get his bad tooth pulled.

The Petitioner Anthony Martini and his wife Annette Martini could no longer stay in Canada and remain alive.

In late 2001 the Petitioner Anthony Martini and Annette Martini were forced to voluntarily surrender their Canadian Citizenship and all Rights being a Canadian.

The Petitioner and his wife wrote letters on February 28, 2002 to President George W. Bush, The White House, U.S. Attorney General John David Ashcroft and the U.S. Department of

Justice begging for a Green Light and Permission to Legally Enter the United States.

The Petitioner Anthony Martini and his Wife Annette Martini Green Light was unopposed.

In July 2002 the Defendant AT&T Inc. finally located the Petitioner's whereabouts and forwarded that information to the Canadian Government and the Canadian Politicians gave that information to the Canadian Police Agencies.

The Petitioner and his Wife were driving on a Highway in Canada and five unmarked Police Cruisers tried to run the Petitioner and his Wife off of the highway and murder the Petitioner and his Wife Annette Martini.

The Petitioner and his wife legally entered the United States of America through the Port of Entry of Plattsburgh, New York.

The Petitioners thought that they were going to escape Political Persecution here in the United States.

The Petitioner and his wife had all of their rights violated in the State of Florida and the Petitioner and his wife filed a Lawsuit against the State of Florida in 2003 attached to the Lawsuit was the then Attorney General of Florida, Charlie Christ and others.

The Petitioner had a Pre-Paid Cell Phone and gave his number to the former I.N.S. in Miami, Florida.

The Petitioner and his wife Annette Martini then had their Cell Phone illegally wire tapped by the then Attorney General of Florida using AT&T.

The Petitioner did not have any service with AT&T.

The Petitioner had an Air Card with Alltel in 2005 to have access to the Internet from his Laptop.

In 2005 the Petitioner and his wife Annette Martini created a Website at www.annettemartini.us and wrote and posted

Articles of all the Human Rights Abuse that was caused by the United States for the entire World to see.

Attorney General of Florida Charlie Crist was running for the Governor of Florida and he used the Defendant AT&T Inc. to stop the Petitioner from accessing his website of AnnetteMartini.US or any other websites that the Petitioner owned.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. illegally hacked into the Petitioner's Air Card and blocked the Petitioner from accessing his websites and posting Articles on his site of www.annettemartini.us .

In October 2006 the Petitioner moved from the State of Florida to the State of California. The Petitioner used his Pre-Paid Cell phone and after getting an apartment the Petitioner called SBC Global to get Phone Service and also Internet Service under his new Business Account.

The Petitioner first telephone bill was from SBC Global. The Petitioner Second bill came from the Defendants AT&T Inc.

The Petitioner then started to immediately have problems with AT&T by having his phone calls being terminated from the Defendant AT&T Inc.

The Petitioner and his wife Annette Martini were immediately placed in False Removal Proceedings that was initiated by the now Governor of Florida Charlie Christ who used the Defendant AT&T Inc. to illegally wiretap the Petitioner's Phones.

The Petitioner filed a Complaint in the U.S. District Court against the Defendant AT&T Inc., AT&T Corp., AT&T Mobility Corp., and AT&T Mobility LLC on Monday, March 17, 2008 Case No. SAV08-00284 (RNBx).

The Petitioner accused the Defendant AT&T of hacking into his servers, computers, websites, sending the Petitioner thousands of

Spam emails, murder, attempted Murder, Political Persecution and the results of an Illegal Wiretapping, web tapping for over 30 years.

The Petitioner accused the other Defendants AT&T Corp., AT&T Mobility Corp., and AT&T Mobility LLC of Fraudulent Billing and ruining the Petitioner's Good Name.

The Petitioner also sued the Defendant the U.S. Homeland Security for ordering the Defendant AT&T of conducting Illegal Wiretaps on the Petitioner Phone Lines, Fax Lines, Cell Phones, emails, web tapping without any Court Order in the United States.

The Petitioner also sued the Defendant AT&T Inc. for sending many mysterious boxes to the Petitioner of which the Petitioner refused service.

The Petitioner suspected that the numerous boxes that was sent from an Airport in Ohio and paid in Cash at the Airport was either a Bomb or dangerous substance to injury or harm the

Petitioner and his wife. The Petitioner knows for a fact that the numerous boxes were sent by either the Defendant AT&T Inc. or by a U.S. Government employee employed at the U.S. Homeland Security because of the Lawsuit.

The Petitioner's wife Annette Martini received a death threat email that the Petitioner knows for a fact came from one of the Defendants because the Petitioner filed a huge lawsuit in the U.S. District Court.

The Petitioner received a threatening email that the Petitioner knows came from the Defendant AT&T Inc. that read as follows: "Drop AT&T Lawsuit or else!."

On July 3, 2007 the Petitioner had all of his 300 plus Internet Domain Names Stolen from his two Control Panels from the Defendant AT&T Inc. who used a Domain Name Registrar of Godaddy.Com Inc. and Wild West Domains Inc. as accomplices.

The Petitioner email account of tonymartini2002@yahoo.com was hacked in by the Defendant AT&T Inc. at the same time that the Petitioner had his two Control Panels for his Internet Domain Names hacked in.

The Defendants AT&T Inc., AT&T Corp., AT&T Mobility Corp., and AT&T Mobility LLC used a Wholesale Attorney from Sidley Austin LLP to file Motions to Dismiss for lack of Jurisdiction.

Each time that the presiding judge dismissed the Petitioner's Complaint for lack of personal Jurisdiction the presiding judge allowed the Petitioner to Amend his Complaint. However, the Presiding Judge, U.S. District Judge Andrew J. Guilford was only playing a game with the Petitioner and was never going to allow the Petitioner to proceed to Trial.

In October 2008, the U.S. District Judge set a Trial Date before the Petitioner and the Defendants Wholesale Attorneys.

The Presiding Judge also had another case before him and that was with the Petitioner who also filed a lawsuit against the Defendants GODADDY.COM INC. and WILD WEST DOMAINS INC.

The Petitioner knows that the U.S. District Court has Jurisdiction over the Defendants and also knew that the presiding Judge was bought by the Defendants AT&T Inc.

The Defendants AT&T Inc. have bought so many Judges in the past 30 years and the Petitioner has information with respect to the Defendant buying and paying off Judges in any country.

The Presiding Judge totally ignored all of the Petitioner's Motions, Complaint, Amended Complaint, Statues, Case Laws etc., when it was pertaining to the Petitioner and the Presiding Judge continued to ONLY entertain the Defendants Motion, Motion to Dismiss.

The Petitioner even filed Motions to put an Injunction on the Defendants to stop attacking his Computers, Servers and Internet Connections and that was all ignored and denied by Judge Andrew J. Guilford which was not normal.

The Presiding Judge had full knowledge that for almost one year the Defendants were not represented in Court by a General Counsel but only a Special Appearance Attorney and the Presiding Judge allowed it. However, the law in the State of California has restrictions to the length of Special Appearance Attorneys and also that Special Appearance Attorneys cannot accept Court Dates or even file Motions and time after time the Presiding Judge totally ignored the Petitioner's Motions, Pleadings and Case Notes, Statues etc.

The Presiding Judge was an unfair Judge who discriminates against Pro-Se.

On February 23, 2009 the U.S. District Judge, Judge Andrew J. Guildford violated the Petitioner's Rights to go to Trial and dismissed

the Case against the Petitioner and placed a Judgment on the Petitioner who is a Victim in this Complaint.

The Presiding Judge never entered a Dollar Amount and just gave the Defendants a Blank Check Judgment against the Petitioner.

The Presiding Judge, Judge Andrew J. Guilford Terminated the Petitioner's other Complaint against the Defendants Godaddy.Com Inc. and Wild West Domains Inc. CASE NO. SACV08-0799 AG (RNBx) twenty-one days after he terminated the Case against AT&T and invited the Defendants Godaddy.Com Inc. and Wild West Domains Inc. to enter a Judgment against the Petitioner.

The Petitioner who studied Law at a University outside of the United States has never heard of a Presiding Judge INVITING the Defendants to enter a Judgment against a victim seeking Justice.

The Presiding Judge again signed an Order for Judgment against the Petitioner who is the Victim and victimized the Petitioner even further abusing his authority and going beyond the scope of the law for his own personal and perhaps criminal gains.

The Presiding Judge had a personal bias against the Petitioner and the Judge's Law firm where he used to be employed client was AT&T Inc. which is a severe conflict of interest.

The Petitioner is demanding that the United States Supreme Court awards the Petitioner the full amount of the Complaint which is Fifty-Seven Billion Dollars Plus Punitive Damages against all of the Defendants AT&T Inc., AT&T Corp., AT&T Mobility Corp., and AT&T Mobility LLC.

RELIEF

The Petitioner Anthony Martini is demanding and praying that the Writ of Certiorari be accepted and that the United States Supreme Court enter a Judgment against the Defendants for the amount of the Complaint which is Fifty Seven Billion Dollars Plus Punitive Damages.

The Petitioner is demanding that the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Unsigned Order dated July 1, 2009 be overturned that Denied the Petitioner Rights to due process.

The Petitioner is also demanding that in the event that the United States Supreme Court allows the Petitioner to go to Trial that the United States Judge, Judge Andrew J. Guilford be removed from this case and that the Defendants cannot use Special Appearance Attorneys or Wholesale Attorneys.

The Petitioner is demanding that all of the Defendants immediately stop their Illegal Wiretaps, Web Tapping, Computer Hacking the Petitioner's Servers, Computers, Laptops, stealing the Petitioner's email accounts and stopping Traffic to all of the Petitioner's Websites.

The Petitioner is demanding a Written Apology and a Public Apology from the Defendants in all newspapers and T.V. Stations worldwide.

The Petitioner is demanding that his Writ of Certiorari be immediately accepted and that the Petitioner has Oral Argument before the United States Supreme Court via Phone because the Petitioner is disabled and cannot travel to this Court.

CONCLUSION

The Petitioner Anthony Martini was subject of Political Persecution and Political Torture for over thirty years because of the illegal actions of the Defendant AT&T who went above

the law to conduct Illegal Wire Taps on the Petitioner for over thirty years and sold the Petitioner's Conversations on the phones to the highest bidders that destroyed the Petitioner.

The Defendant A&T Inc. are responsible for the Petitioner's Two Daughters being Kidnapped and the Petitioner's Second Daughter being Murdered at seventeen Months old because of the Defendant AT&T Illegal Actions.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. are responsible for the Petitioner's Adopted Mother being Murdered.

The Petitioner has the Legal and Constitutional Rights to have his case heard before a Judge and Jury and not just a Judge when the Petitioner demanded a Jury.

The Petitioner has a Legal Right as a Father to bring the Murderers which are AT&T Inc. to Trial to face Civil Action and Wrongful Death Action and to finally get Final Justice for his Daughter that was Murdered at Seventeen Months Old because of the Defendant AT&T Inc. Illegal Actions.

The Petitioner's Constitutional Rights and Legal Rights were all violated by the United States District Court Judge Andrew J. Guilford and also by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

The Petitioner has a Legal Right and a Constitutional Rights to have his Appeal heard by a Panel of Three Judges at the Appellant Court and not have his Case heard by Paralegals.

The Defendants have placed nearly 90% of all Law Firms in the United States on Contract Basis which prevents the Petitioner to hire any Law Firms or Attorneys.

The Defendants Illegal Actions of placing over 90% of the Attorneys and Law Firms on Contract Basis violates the Racketeering Laws of the United States of America.

The Petitioner had over 27 major corporations destroyed because of the Defendant AT&T Inc. Illegal Actions and the Defendant AT&T Inc. conducting Illegal Wire Taps on the Petitioner's Phone Lines for over thirty years.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. is responsible for the Petitioner being made permanently disabled and shortened the Petitioner's life by thirty years.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. is responsible for the Petitioner having two Brain Tumors.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. is responsible for the Petitioner being in Chronic Pain 24/7.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. Board of Directors, Executives, Presidents, CEOs are all members of a Domestic and International Terrorist Organizations known as the Bilderberg, Skull and Bones aka "The Order" the Good Ole Boys Network. Freemasons and will go out of their way to take an Innocent Life and either destroy that innocent person or murder that person for their own personal. Financial, criminal gains and to dominate the entire Global Market including go beyond the law and bribing Politicians, Judges, Congressmen, Senators and other World Leaders.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. will stop at nothing to finish their Job to have the Petitioner Murdered at all costs.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. has demonstrated time and time again for over thirty years how far that they will go to Persecute the Petitioner and end the Petitioner's life.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. are responsible for thousands of lives either being destroyed or murdered.

The Petitioner was a Former Private Investigator for over 25 years and the Petitioner is well known worldwide for his investigation work and his articles.

The Petitioner is demanding that the United States Supreme Court reverse the United States Court of Appeals Final Order that was dated on July 1, 2009.

The Petitioner is also demanding that the United States Supreme Court enters a Judgment against the Defendants for the full amount of the Petitioner's Complaint for Fifty-Seven Billion Dollars Plus Punitive Damages.

The Defendants wasted an entire year of the Petitioner's life and the Defendants were unrepresented at all times in Court and the Defendants failed to respond point by point to the Petitioner's Complaint and Amended Complaints.

The United States Supreme Court should enter a Judgment in favor of the Petitioner for using "Whole Sale Attorneys" or Special Appearance Attorney for one year.

The Petitioner is demanding that the United States Supreme Court places an Injunction on all of the Defendants for Illegal Wire Tapping the Petitioner's telephone lines, further terrorizing the Petitioner and to stop selling the Petitioner's Conversations to anyone including Foreign Governments.

The Defendant AT&T Inc. is not American Owned but rather British Owned who have been

spying on the United States for over 75 years and selling all information to foreign countries including enemies of the United States.

The Defendants have conspired to commit Murder against the Petitioner Anthony Martini and the Defendants are accomplices to Murder, Kidnapping and made the Petitioner permanently disabled for the rest of his life being in pain 24/7.

The Petitioner Anthony Martini "**WRIT OF CERTIORARI" should be Granted.**

Respectfully Submitted,

ANTHONY MARTINI

2540 Eastbluff Dr. Suite 274

Newport Beach, California,

92660-3500

amartini@attorneysaccess.com
(619) 201-7390

Petitioner / Pro-Se

APPENDIX

APPENDIX "A"

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

STAMP – JUL 01 2009

ANTHONY MARTINI,

Plaintiff – Appellant,

v.

AT&T, INC.; et al,

Defendants – Appellees.

No. 09-55487

D.C. No. 8:08-cv-00294-AG-RNB

Central District of California,

ORDER

APPENDIX "A"

Before: PAEZ, TALLMAN and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Appellant's June 4, 2009 response to the Appellate Commissioner's May 15, 2009 order is construed as a motion for reconsideration of that order. So construed, the motion is denied.

A review of the record indicates that the questions raised in the appeal are so insubstantial as not to require further argument. *See United States v. Hooton*, 693 F.2d 857, 858 (9th Cir. 1982) (per curiam) (stating standard). The district court did not err in dismissing appellant's third amended complaint for failure to state a claim and for lack of personal jurisdiction. *See Sprewell v. Golden State Warriors*, 266 F.3d 979, 988 (9th Cir. 2001)(courts are not required to accept as true wholly conclusory allegations); *George v. Pacific-CSC Work Furlough*, 91 SVG/Pro SeF. 3d 1227, 1229 (9th Cir. 1999) (claim for violation of

APPENDIX "A"

constitutional rights does not lie against private parties). *See also Johnson v. State of California*, 207 F.3d 650, 656 (9th Cir. 2000) (holding district court properly dismissed vague and conclusory conspiracy allegations for failure to state a claim).

Accordingly, we summarily affirm the district court's judgment.

No motions for reconsideration, rehearing, modification, clarification, stay of the mandate or any other submissions shall be filed or entertained in this closed docket.

AFFIRMED.

/unsigned/

APPENDIX "B"

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

STAMP – MAY 15, 2009

ANTHONY MARTINI,

Plaintiff – Appellant,

v.

AT&T, INC.; et al,

Defendants – Appellees.

No. 09-55487

D.C. No. 8:08-cv-00294-AG-RNB

Central District of California,

ORDER

Before: Peter L. Shaw, Appellate Commissioner.

APPENDIX "B"

Appellant's document filed by this court on April 28, 2009 is constructed as a motion for reconsideration of this court's April 8, 2009 order. So construed, the motion is denied. See 9th Cir. R.27-10; 9th Cir. R. 27-1 (Circuit Advisory Comm. Note).

A review of the record demonstrates that this appeal may be appropriate for summary disposition because the questions on which the decision in the appeal depends may be so insubstantial as not to justify further proceedings. See 9th Cir. R. 3-6. Within 21 days after the date of this order, appellant shall show cause why the judgment in this appeal should not be summarily affirmed. Appellees may file a reply to appellant's response within ten days after service of the response.

JW/Pro Se

APPENDIX "B"

Appellant's failure to comply with this order shall result in the automatic dismissal of this appeal by the Clerk for failure to prosecute. See 9th Cir. R. 42-1.

/unsigned/

JW/Pro Se 09-55487

APPENDIX "C"

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CASE NO: 08:08-cv-00294-AG(RNBx)

JUDGMENT

Dated: March 04, 2009

ANTHONY MARTINI,

PLAINTIFF,

v.

AT&T INC., AT&T CORP., AT&T MOBILITY CORP. (DE) and AT&T MOBILITY LLC,

DEFENDANTS.

The Court, on February 23, 2009, having dismissed the Third Amended Complaint without leave to amend; therefore;

APPENDIX "C"

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, DECREED AND ADJUDGED that this action is dismissed in its entirety. Plaintiff shall take nothing and judgment is hereby entered in favor of Defendants AT&T Inc., AT&T Corp., AT&T Mobility Corp. (DE), and AT&T Mobility LLC.

Dated: March 04, 2009

/s/

Honorable Andrew J. Guilford

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT

LA1 1490813v.2

APPENDIX "D"

JS-6

"O"

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CASE NO. SACV 08-0294 AG (RNBx)

ORDER

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT

Dated: February 23, 2009

Defendants AT&T Inc., AT&T Corp., AT&T Mobility Corp., and AT&T Mobility LLC ("Defendants".) filed a motion to dismiss (the "Motion") Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint (the "TAC"). The Court GRANTS the Motion for

lack of personal jurisdiction as to Defendant AT&T Inc. and for failure to state a claim as to all Defendants.

The Court grants the Motion without leave to amend. Courts are lenient with *pro se* plaintiffs in satisfying pleading requirements. Noll v. Carlson, 809 F.2d 1446, 1448 (9th Cir. 1987). But this leniency has limits, and dismissal without leave to amend is appropriate when a *pro se* plaintiff repeatedly files defective despite instructions from the court regarding what the deficiencies are and how they can be cured. Ferris v. Santa Clara County, 891 F.2d 715, 719 (9th Cir. 1989). In this case, pro se plaintiff Anthony Martini ("Plaintiff") has filed four complaints – the Complaint, the First Amended Complaint (the "FAC"), the Second Amended Complaint (the "SAC"), and the TAC. Each time, Plaintiff has failed to state a claim. The Court has instructed Plaintiff on how to resolve the deficiencies in his

complaint. For example, the Court "advise[d] Plaintiff to amend his complaint by adding specific legal bases for his claims against Defendants." (June 2, 2008 Order 4:13-14). Plaintiff has not followed the Court's instructions.

BACKGROUND

The Court's previous orders give sufficient background to this case. (Aug. 12, 2008 Order; Aug. 29, 2008 Order; Nov. 24, 2008 Order.) The Court will not repeat that information here. The Court dismissed the SAC, Plaintiff's most recent complaint, for lack of personal jurisdiction as to defendant AT&T Inc. and for failure to state a claim as to all Defendants. The Court explained that "Plaintiff's allegations continue to be speculative, conclusory, and unreasonable. They

do not connect a wrong *with a legal remedy*." (Nov. 24, 2008 Order.)

Plaintiff filed the TAC, which alleges the following claims: (1) violation of the First and Forth Amendments; and (2) violation of 50 U.S.C. § 1809, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act ("FISA").

ANALYSIS

1. PERSONAL JURISDICTION OVER AT&T INC.

Plaintiff fails to show that the Court has personal jurisdiction over AT&T Inc. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2), a defendant may bring a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. Although the

defendant is the moving party on such a motion, the plaintiff bears the burden of making a prima facie showing of facts establishing personal jurisdiction by a Constitution protects individual rights only from government action, not from *private* action." *Single Moms, Inc. v. Dorscher*, 331 F.3d 743, 746 (9th Cir. 2003) (emphasis in original). "[I]ndividuals bringing actions against private parties for infringement of their [First and Forth Amendment] rights...must show that the private parties' infringement somehow constitutes state action." *George v. Pacific-CSC Work Furlough*, 91 F.3d 1227, 1229 (9th Cir. 1999). That "state action" must be action by the United States or a state government, not a foreign government. *Stonehill v. United States*, 505 F. 2d 738, 743 (9th Cir. 1968).

In the TAC, Plaintiff asserts that AT&T Corp. and AT&T Inc., acted as an instrument or agent of the Foreign Government which is

Canada..." (TAC ¶ 58.) It is not enough to assert that a private party acted as a state actor for a foreign government. Plaintiff does not say that "the U.S. Government knew of and/or acquiesced in all of the above-described acts of AT&T Inc., and AT&T Corp...." (ID. ¶ 56.) This vague assertion is not sufficient to state a claim for violation of Plaintiff's First and Forth Amendment rights. See, e.g., *United States v. Gumerlock*, 590 F.2d 794, 800 (9th Cir, 1979) (finding that a private search did not implicate the Forth Amendment without government "particip[ation]" or "encourage[ment]); Skinner v. Railway Labor Exec. Ass., 489 U.S. 602, 615 (1989) (finding that a Forth Amendment violation requires more than the Government's "passive conduct"). The Court GRANTS the Motion as to Plaintiff's first claim for violation of the First and Forth Amendments.

2.2 Plaintiff's second claim for violation of FISA

APPENDIX "D"

Plaintiff's second claim contains nothing but broad, vague accusations of torture, murder, and espionage committed by AT&T with the U.S. and Canadian governments. These are the same general accusations Plaintiff made in the previous complaints. Like the previous complaints, the TAC's assertions are speculative, conclusory, and unreasonable. They do not connect a wrong with a legal remedy. The Court GRANTS the Motion as to Plaintiff's second claim of violation of FISA.

3. CONCLUSION

Plaintiff fails to allege personal jurisdiction over AT&T Inc. Plaintiff fails to state a claim against any Defendant under his claim for violation of the First and Forth Amendments, or his second claim for violation of FISA.

APPENDIX "D"

DISPOSITION

The Court GRANTS the Motion for lack of personal jurisdiction as to Defendant AT&T Inc. and for failure to state a claim as to all Defendants. The Court grants the Motion without leave to amend.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: February 23, 2009

/s/
Andrew J. Guilford
United States District Judge